UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/586,825	08/14/2008	Sung-Ik Park	51876P1119	8986
	7590 01/27/201 <b>KOLOFF TAYLOR &amp;</b>	EXAMINER		
1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY			SHEN, QUN	
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2617	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/27/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/586,825	PARK ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
QUN SHEN	2617	

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on t	the cover sheet with the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 19 January 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICA	ATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the san this application, applicant must timely file one of the following rep places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of A a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 3 time periods:	lies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).	SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee d statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance we filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension the a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the AMENDMENTS	ereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior</li> <li>(a) They raise new issues that would require further considerat</li> <li>(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</li> </ol>	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form appeal; and/or	for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a correspondent NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	onding number of finally rejected claims.
<ul> <li>4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See</li> <li>5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ul>	
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable non-allowable claim(s).	
7. Solution For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will in how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided be The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:	
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1, 6-9, 14-16</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>see continuation sheet</u> . AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcom showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was	e <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	status of the claims after entry is below or attached.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does Need continuation sheet.	
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (PTO/Sf</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	3/08) Paper No(s)
/Jinsong Hu/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617	/QUN SHEN/ Examiner, Art Unit 2617

## **Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)**

Application No.

continuation sheet of 7: amendments only address claim objections for informality.

continuation sheet of 11:

Applicant's arguments filed on January 19, 2011 have been considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant essentially argues that Razavi's teaching is not relevant to the claimed invention with the rationale that Fig 6 of Razavi does not concern I and Q channel and Fig 16 is only in analog domain. Examiner would like to point out that Fig 6 shows a baseband pulse shaping operation that includes a shaping filter implemented in the baseband digital domain (stored in a ROM) and a digital to signal converter (DAC). The output of DAC is then an analog signal to be up-converted to RF frequency. Razavi also teaches such baseband shaping filter is applied to IS-54, IS-95 and other spread spectrum based standard (page 198). In fact, the baseband shaping filter has been specified in various wireless communication standards, including IS-54 and IS-95 as described in Razavi. An ordinary skill in the art would understand that, in IS-95 for example, the baseband signals include I signal and Q signal. Such shaping filter would have to be applied to both I and Q signals to condition the transmission signals in order to meet FCC regulation and requirement with respect to out of band inferences. Fig 20 shows the direct conversion in the analog domain (after the shaping filter and DAC). Therefore, Razavi's teachings include both digital and direct conversion in the analog domain for both I and Q signals, which is relevant to the claimed invention.

Therefore, the rejection of previous office action is maintained.

Amendments to claims 6-8 and 14-16 have been considered. The objection to claims 6-8 and 14-16 have been withdrawn.